

09/596,365

MS150900.2

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A listing of the claims is found at pages 2-8. Claims 1 and 24 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-12 and 14-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-12 and 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Newell *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,466,232. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

"A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) Emphasis added. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite in part a mechanism designed to access and store information regarding context information and notification parameters, *the notification parameters including at least one of a relevance parameter, a novelty parameter, and a fidelity parameter ...* These parameters are employed for relaying notifications from notification sources to notification sinks. The parameters indicate such aspects as a likelihood of the relevance of information, whether or not an entity already knows information, and/or the loss of value of information upon truncation of such information.

In sharp contrast, Newell *et al.* neither discloses nor suggests such parameters for directing notifications. Moreover, Newell *et al.* discloses a system for directing output from a computer or program to one or more output devices. Newell *et al.* does not describe a system for coupling notification sources to notification sinks *via notifications*

09/596,365

MS150900.2

as recited in the subject claims. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn for claim 1 and claims 2-18 which depend therefrom.

With respect to claim 19, Newell *et al.* does not disclose employing a decision-theoretic analysis for transmitting notifications as recited in claim 19. Such analysis can be utilized to infer a variable's state based upon uncertainty. Although Newell *et al.* discusses uncertainty, Newell *et al.* only discloses that a variable may be represented as having varying degrees of uncertainty (*See* Col. 7, lines 52-55). Thus, Newell *et al.* does not disclose how to determine the variable's state let alone mention that intelligent techniques such as inference may be employed. Since Newell *et al.* neither discloses nor suggests performing decision-theoretic analysis as recited in claim 19, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for claim 19 and claims 20-23 which depend therefrom.

Regarding claim 24, claim 24 for has been amended herein to recite a notification source having at least three of parameters such as importance, time criticality, relevance, novelty, and fidelity. As noted above with respect to amended claim 1, Newell *et al.* neither discloses nor suggests such features. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn for claim 24 and claims 25-27 which depend therefrom.

Regarding claims 28 and 30, these claims recite in part determining which of the *notifications* to convey to which of one or more notification sinks based at least in part on the contextual information and the information regarding the notification parameters. As noted above with respect to claim 1, Newell *et al.* is an output-driven program for directing data from an application program to output devices. Thus, Newell *et al.* only describes how to direct *output* with regard a single program or computer to one or more output devices. In contrast, the present invention as recited in claims 28 and 30 determine *which of the notifications* from one or more notification sources are to be directed to one or more notification sinks. As such, since Newell *et al.* only describes directing information from a single point (*e.g.*, application or computer to output devices) there is no disclosure or suggestion for determining which of the notifications to convey as recited in claims 28 and 30. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for claims 28 (and claim 29 which depends therefrom) and 30.

09/596,365

MS150900.2

II. Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Newell as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lefebvre *et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0046299. Lefebvre *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Newell *et al.* with respect to amended claim 1. Notably, Lefebvre *et al.* does not teach or suggest the notification parameters recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731